

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/912,812	BEAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason T. Whipkey	2622	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Now allowed

(1) Jason Whipkey.

(3) _____.

(2) Brian Rosenbloom.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 June 2006

Time: 1:15 p.m.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1,4,5 and 21-25.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



TUAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposed corrections to claims 1, 5, and 21-25 to correct typographical and antecedent basis errors. The attorney for Applicant approved these changes. Additionally, the examiner noted that the amendment to claim 4 has rendered it noncompliant with the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as the specification does not disclose any partial depression of the shutter button. The attorney for Applicant proposed the change shown on the Examiner's Amendment.